



Memorandum

Date: February 19, 2013
To: City Council
From: Evan Maxim, Senior Planner
Re: Planning Commission review of ECA evaluation forms

Background

On July 26, 2012 the Planning Commission directed the staff to prepare Evaluation Forms for the Commission's ECA review in September; the Evaluation Forms were completed by staff using the rules established by the "Rating Key" and "Overall Effect" (tab 2 in Volume 1). In September of 2012, the Planning Commission began their review of the Evaluation Forms.

The Planning Commission used the Evaluation Forms for their review from September 2012 through January 2013, and changes were considered throughout the review process. Generally, there were three types of changes that the Planning Commission directed the staff to prepare:

- A. Edits to the evaluation form originally prepared by the staff to address Planning Commission revisions to the criteria and / or rating. These edits did not change the substance of the proposed amendment and were normally reflected in "track changes" (underline for added language, ~~strikeout~~ for deleted language);
- B. Evaluation forms were prepared to consider new alternatives to items that resulted in an overall effect of "Negative". These alternatives were designed to address the objective of the proposed amendment, in a way that would result in an overall effect of "Positive". These alternative evaluation forms were identified with addition of a letter at the end of the item number (e.g. 3-19b, 3-19c, 3-19d, etc);
- C. Evaluations forms that addressed multiple objectives through an entirely different approach resulted in the creation of a new item number (for example, items 2-1 and 2-2, which rated an overall "Negative" were addressed through a different approach, identified as item 2-13). These are listed in the following section.

Alternative Evaluation Forms

The Planning Commission identified several policy objectives that required entirely different approaches, which are summarized below:

- a) Item 2-1, 2-2, and alternative item 2-13 – Items 2-1 and 2-2 are related to the identification of species of concern within Sammamish, and a possible increase in wildlife corridor widths; both items resulted in an overall rating of "Negative". Staff proposed an alternative approach (item 2-13) to the protection of wildlife, which incorporates a site specific analysis of sites located near to high value environmental critical areas and a establishes wildlife corridors based upon the site specific analysis.
- b) Item 2-10, 2-11, 2-12, 3-17, 3-18 and alternative item 2-14 – The Planning Commission received significant public comment suggesting the site specific identification of wetland and stream buffers, different buffer widths for wetlands and streams in developed and undeveloped conditions, and a revised definition of streams. Staff proposed an alternative approach (item 2-14) to clarify the protections provided for existing, legally established site improvements (e.g. house, garage, driveway), and to provide additional flexibility in expanding legally established site improvements by up to 1,000 square feet.